

## REMARKS

This amendment supplements the meritorious arguments previously presented by Applicants in Response D, filed September 27, 2005. The amendments to independent claims 11 and 13 presented herein are for the purposes of expediting prosecution only, and do not alter the substance of the arguments previously presented. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider those remarks, and withdraw the outstanding Section 103 rejection for at least the reasons of record, and/or in light of the clarifying amendments presented herein.

Specifically, Applicants have amended independent claims 11 and 13 to clarify that the period during which neither data writing nor data erasing is performed is actually a period during which the data is held without performing either the data writing process or the data erasing process. Support for this clarification can be found at least at page 19 of the Specification, and Fig. 9. This clarification further highlights the inappropriateness of the outstanding rejection of claims 11 and 13. Contrary to the Examiner's cursory denial in the Advisory Action mailed November 2, 2005, neither Kawakami nor Miyazawa can read upon the present invention, whether taken alone or together.

Applicants further submit that the Examiner's remarks in the Advisory Action are nonresponsive. Applicants have presented specific meritorious arguments explaining in detail how the cited prior art references do not read upon the specific features and limitations recited in the present invention. A mere statement of disagreement by the Examiner is not a

rebuttal to these arguments. The Examiner's additional comment that the claimed structures of the present invention are "broad" does not rebut these arguments either. The Examiner has not rejected the claims as being unduly broad. Therefore, the standard by which the Examiner should be examining the claims is according to their novelty, and not the breadth. Applicants have sufficiently demonstrated how claims 11 and 13 of the present invention are both novel and nonobvious over the nonanalogous teachings of Miyazawa and Kawakami. Applicants also note that the Examiner has also failed to address his clear misinterpretation of the Kawakami reference in particular on the record.

Accordingly, for all of the foregoing reasons of record, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 11-14, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney again if a further interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Josh C. Snider

Registration No. 47,954

**Customer No. 24978**

November 28, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: (312) 360-0080

Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\1100\65170\9Q1231.DOC